

gen

DUKE UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

DEC 21 1961

DURHAM, N. C.

ACLS

NEWSLETTER

AMERICAN COUNCIL OF LEARNED SOCIETIES
A MEMBER OF THE INTERNATIONAL UNION OF ACADEMIES

Volume XII
December 1961
Number Ten

<i>Contents</i>	<i>Page</i>
The Job of the Humanist Scholar	3
The ACLS Summer Institute Program: An Evaluation	11
Correspondence	16

45 EAST 46th STREET, NEW YORK 17, NEW YORK

THE AMERICAN COUNCIL OF LEARNED SOCIETIES

The American Council of Learned Societies is a private non-profit federation of thirty national scholarly organizations concerned with the humanities and the humanistic aspects of the social sciences.

The object of the American Council of Learned Societies, as set forth in its constitution, is "the advancement of humanistic studies in all fields of learning and the maintenance and strengthening of relations among the national societies devoted to such studies."

The Council was organized in 1919 and incorporated in the District of Columbia in 1924. Its principal support comes from the philanthropic foundations, supplemented, on occasion, by government contracts for specific enterprises.

Entered under Bulk Mailing Permit No. 41118 at the Post Office at Washington, D. C. Published monthly except July and August by the American Council of Learned Societies. Address all communications regarding the *ACLS Newsletter* to the American Council of Learned Societies at 345 East 46th Street, New York 17, New York.

THE FORD HUMANITIES PROJECT AT PRINCETON: THE JOB OF THE HUMANIST SCHOLAR

By RICHARD SCHLATTER

*Professor of History, Rutgers University
Director*

What is the purpose of humanistic scholarship? What, in fact, does the humanist scholar do?

A discussion of recent American scholarship in the humanities might well begin with a definition of the humanities. This one will not. I assume we all agree that a literary scholar is a humanist, a geologist is a physical scientist, and an economist is a social scientist.

In other disciplines, of course, the line dividing the humanist from the two varieties of scientist becomes blurred. Historians are likely to call themselves humanists when they apply for funds to the American Council of Learned Societies, social scientists when they apply for funds to the Social Science Research Council, and scientists without predicate when they apply to the National Science Foundation. Philosophers who study logic are surely more akin to mathematical scientists than to their humanist colleagues, anthropologists are to be found in all three of the great classes, and biology was, not so long ago, less a science than a humanistic study which talked of purposes and final causes and good and bad (the legendary American pomologist, Johnny Appleseed, detested grafted trees because they are unnatural and thus wicked). And philosophers and historians study science, although this does not make them scientists. At Rutgers, the State University of New Jersey, students may count History of Religion for social science credit (since it is history) or for humanities credit (since it is religion). The Princeton University catalogue states that "certain courses in mathematics" may satisfy the requirements in the area of *History, Philosophy, Religion* (where History appears to be classified with the humanities).

Without tarrying to solve the problem of definition, assuming that we all know in a general way what we mean by the humanities, what can we say about the accomplishments of American humanistic scholarship in recent decades?

The humanities have been much discussed and written about in the past twenty-five years. I have in my office several shelves of recent books on the subject. Perhaps there are so many books because each of them is necessarily imprecise. All of them have something to say, some of them are good books, but they make a dreary collection.

Humanist scholars are increasingly embarrassed by, and scornful of, general defenses of the humanities and sentimental praises of their place in a liberal

education and in a free society. Perhaps that is because humanist scholars are already fully convinced of the importance of the humanities; perhaps they sense that general statements about the importance of the humanities will not convince men who have no knowledge of them. Or perhaps it is because the defenders of the humanities have won their war and like old generals should be left quietly to fade away.

At the beginning of the modern era, the classical humanities (which then included the sciences as one branch of classical literature), captured the medieval universities. Subsequently, modern history, languages and literatures, and modern philosophy, fought a bitter and successful battle with the classics for the right to call themselves humanities and thus to be admitted to the rank of respectable academic disciplines. Together, the humanities, classical and modern, dominated the universities of the western world almost until the beginning of the twentieth century. Once made respectable, the modern humanists were as determined as the classicists had been to defend the *status quo* against all innovators. *Humanitas humanitatis, omnia erat humanitas.*

But in the twentieth century the natural sciences, which most present-day humanists would agree are the principal achievement of modern civilization, became in their turn respectable inhabitants of the scholastic community. So spectacular was the success of the sciences that, together with the social sciences and related vocational and technical studies, they seemed to threaten the very existence of the humanities. And in fact, when religion and science appeared to be incompatible academic fellows, religion was driven out of the liberal arts college.

But the humanities have survived. Perhaps their present position of strength owes something to the arguments of the books which now seem tedious, embarrassing, and cliché-ridden.

Sixty years ago, William Graham Sumner wanted to abolish the philosophy department at Yale: "We might as well have professors of alchemy or fortune telling." Henry Ford, who was a technologist of distinction, is reported to have said, "History is bunk." Today, perhaps, the danger is not that scientists undervalue the humanities but that the humanists are ignorant of science and can find no ready way to cure that ignorance; and the fortune which Ford's genius assembled is supporting historical and other varieties of humanistic scholarship. A generation of young Americans with more leisure and greater freedom from material anxieties than any other in history turns inevitably to the humanities as one source of the knowledge which will rescue them from that unexamined life which is not worth living. Inevitably, an educated citizenry looks to the humanistic scholar for guidance in its search for a true popular culture which will be more delightful than the monotonous products of the entertainment industry.

Scientist vs. Humanist

This is not to say, of course, that all the intellectual disagreements and practical conflicts of the past between scientists and humanists have died away, or, indeed, ever will. How the knowledge which the scientist seeks differs, if it does differ, from that which the humanistic scholar seeks is still an important question. The construction of an ideal college curriculum is a never-ending and emotionally charged occupation of college faculties. The Chairman of the Board tells the graduating class that his corporation wants young men with a broad humanistic training, but the personnel officer hires a thoroughly trained chemist or economist; medical schools set minimum premedical requirements and urge undergraduates to diversify their studies, but the undergraduate catalogue warns: "Many of the leading medical schools have requirements well beyond the minimum and are selecting only those candidates who are best prepared."

But we are agreed that science, technology, and the humanities must cooperate and live in mutual dependence if our civilization is to continue. Humanist scholars need no longer defend their right to a place in the sun; they can get on with their job. Perhaps that is their best defense; concrete accomplishment is more convincing than rhetoric and one good example of solid humanistic scholarship equals a dozen books in praise of that scholarship.

But it is well that men who are getting on with the job should pause from time to time and ask themselves just what they are doing and how well they are doing it. The distinguished group of scholars working together in the Ford Humanities Project proposes to examine with a critical eye the history of recent American scholarship and ask those questions.

But what is the job of the humanist scholar? And what are the idols which lure him away from his goal?

The task of the humanist scholar is to make available to the present the whole cultural heritage of mankind. He rescues from the oblivion of the past, for the benefit of each new generation, every worthy creation of the human spirit.

To do this, the humanist must be able to judge what is worthy. "His task is not merely 'appreciation' but also criticism, not a blind reverence before the fashionable and the accepted but a serious attempt to estimate greatness critically, to help us decide in what it consists, to aid us in developing that sort of appreciation which rests on a deep critical understanding. The humanist does not preach or exhort; it is not his task to bully us into admiring, but rather to reveal the admirable to us, whether in literature, in art, or in intellectual achievement."

Although the humanist is inevitably an historian, he is not merely so. For as he ranges over the contemporary world the humanist has still the same re-

sponsibility: to bring the world to a critical understanding of what is excellent. The humanist ought to draw to our attention what matters in the present as well as what matters in the past.

Again, if the humanist is inevitably an historian, he must also be a philosopher—he must reflect critically on his criteria of judgment; he must know how to distinguish the shoddy and meretricious from the excellent and admirable.

To suggest that the humanist is deeply concerned with values is a modern cliché: it is also a truism which, however shyly and fleetingly, we must mention. When the program of the Ford Humanities Project was being drafted, a noted Princeton historian wrote to us, "Please, no talk of values." But a few months later the same historian included these words in his remarkable and scholarly study of the history of science: "This book is written in the conviction that it [science] is the distinctive achievement of our history, and that nothing less momentous than the preservation of our culture hangs on understanding its growth and bearing. But the influence of science is not simply comfortable. For neither in public nor in private life can science establish an ethic. It tells us what we can do, never what we should. Its absolute incompetence in the realm of values is a necessary consequence of the objective posture." (C. C. Gillispie, *The Edge of Objectivity*, Princeton, 1960, p. 154)

The task, then, of the humanist is to clear away the obstacles to our understanding of the past, to make our whole cultural heritage—primitive, pre-Columbian, African, Asian, aboriginal, Near-Eastern, classical, medieval, European, American, contemporary, and all the rest—accessible to us. He must sift the whole of man's culture again and again, re-assessing, re-interpreting, re-discovering, translating into a modern idiom, making available the materials and the blueprints with which his contemporaries can build their own culture, bringing to the center of the stage that which a past generation has judged irrelevant but which is now again usable, sending into storage that which has become, for the moment, too-familiar and too-habitual to stir our imagination, preserving it for a posterity to which it will once more seem fresh.

The humanist does all this by the exercise of exact scholarship. He must have the erudition of the historian, the critical abilities of the philosopher, the objectivity of the scientist, and the imagination of all three. The scholar who studies the history of science, for example, must combine a knowledge of languages, history, and philosophy, with the knowledge of a scientist. And so on with the scholars who study music, art, literature, religion, and all the rest.

The job is, obviously, impossible for any man; and the humanist scholar, knowing he can never attain his true goal, is always tempted to run after wooden idols whose cults are less exacting and who proffer an easy bliss.

Dilettante or Pedant

Sometimes the humanist is tempted to bypass the rigorous training of the scholar and to wrap himself in the cloak of the sophist. Then he lapses into a painful wooliness. This is the "literary" sort of humanist whose only accomplishment is a style which achieves the appearance of sublimity at the cost of an actual inanity. His opposite number is the hardheaded humanist who reacts against empty loftiness by becoming a pedant: he devotes himself to anti-quarian detail no less trivial than the banalities of some social science or the mere collecting spirit which is sometimes found in the natural sciences. "Physical science can be at least as trivial as any other form of inquiry: but this is less obvious to the outsider because the triviality is concealed in the decent obscurity of a learned language."

Given the magnitude of his task and the impossibility of total perfection, the humanist scholar must, of course, specialize and his works will often be esoteric. But the belief persists that somehow specialization must be converted to generalization if the humanist scholar is to complete his job. Humanist scholars have not solved the problems of excessive specialization and must share the blame for that catastrophe of communication which besets modern learning.

Humanist scholars have been accused of being overly-genteel, contemptuous of popular culture, snobbish and anti-democratic after the fashion of their aristocratic Renaissance progenitors, backward looking, hostile to the present, fearful of the future, ignorantly petulant about science, technology, and the Industrial Revolution—"natural Luddites" according to C. P. Snow. "It is a sad thought indeed that our civilization has not produced a *New Vision*," a modern technologist complains, "which could guide us into the new 'Golden Age' which has now become physically possible, but only physically . . . Who is responsible for this tragi-comedy of Man frustrated by success? . . . Who has left Mankind without a vision? The predictable part of the future may be a job for electronic predictors but that part of it which is not predictable, which is largely a matter of free human choice, is not the business of the machines, nor of scientists . . . but it ought to be, as it was in the great epochs of the past, the prerogative of the inspired humanists." (Dennis Gabor, "Inventing the Future," *Encounter*, May, 1960, p. 15.)

Scholars in the humanities may modestly reject the suggestion that they can ever be the inspired prophets of a new age. But their scholarship is essential to enable us to distinguish the inspired prophets from the fanatical Pied Pipers.

The Ford Humanities Project is to look at American humanistic scholarship of recent decades, describe it, and attempt to sift the imaginative, the original, the admirable, from the pedantic, the conventional, and the superficial.

From the beginning we agreed that separate programs should be established in each of the various fields. Our final aim is to make a critical description and evaluation of the whole of humanistic scholarship in America in recent decades. But each of the fields has its own particular problems and methods; and the fields are, of course, at very different stages of development. Philosophy, for example, is the most ancient of the disciplines and musicology is one of the newest. Each field has its own critics; philosophy is accused of fragmentation and specialization; religion is accused of demanding credal commitments incompatible with free scholarly inquiry; the ancient classics are said to be necessarily a minor concern of twentieth-century culture; the proliferation of literary studies bewilders the scholar who searches for their common method and purpose; scholars, critics, and artists are uneasy colleagues in the American university. So we are beginning by studying each of the fields separately. The fields, somewhat arbitrarily selected, are art, history, literature, music, philosophy, religion, Asian Studies, classics and linguistics.

We came to the conclusion that the best way to proceed would be to gather excellent scholars in the various fields, tell them what our purpose was, and then give them a free hand. We have invited a number of very good people who are coming to Princeton for a year, a term, or a summer; and in a few cases, we have invited scholars to do some writing for the Project without leaving their home bases. All of these men are to be given, as a matter of course, full freedom to determine what they should do within the framework of our general purpose.

If we determine our purpose too narrowly and in too great detail, we shall inhibit the workmen. But the general aim is to write a series of essays and volumes which will be contributions to that part of intellectual history which has to do with scholarship in the Humanities. We are not primarily interested in American educational techniques: much has already been written about the teaching of the humanities in schools and colleges, the organization of humanities courses, and so on. We are not primarily interested in the training of scholars—graduate programs, Ph.D. requirements, and so on. Other studies of these matters have been made or are under way. We are not primarily interested in conventional "reviews of recent studies": these are done satisfactorily by the learned journals in each field; and they are addressed to the specialists in each field. We are interested in scholarship; and we have a definite audience in mind.

Our audience is the whole scholarly community, both in America and abroad. The people working in our project will address themselves to the colleges and universities, the learned societies, the university presses, and the philanthropic foundations who are interested in helping humanistic scholarship. We should address ourselves not to specialists as such, but to scholars in the broadest context in the hope that we may foster understanding and fruitful cooperation among the various humanistic disciplines and between the

humanities, the social sciences, and the natural sciences. To put it negatively, we are not interested primarily either in the reader who has no scholarly interest nor in the scholar who is interested only in his own speciality.

Although we have decided to begin by taking each of the fields separately, we hope to be able to bring them all together in the end. We propose to provide every opportunity here at Princeton for the scholars in all the fields to come together and talk with one another. We hope that the end product will be a demonstration of what humanistic scholarship as a whole has contributed to intellectual life in America, what its strengths and weaknesses have been, and what tasks lie immediately ahead.

In the end, we will have a series of about a dozen volumes by recognized scholars in each field. These volumes will give us an account of American humanistic scholarship enabling us to see just what that scholarship has contributed to the culture of America and the world.

The job of the humanist scholar is to organize our huge inheritance of culture, to make the past available to the present, to make the whole of civilization available to men who necessarily live in one small corner for one little stretch of time, and finally, to judge, as a critic, the actions of the present by the experience of the past.

ORGANIZATION OF THE PROJECT

Art and Archaeology

Three essays: James Ackerman (Harvard)—American Scholarship in Western Art History; Wen Fong (Princeton)—American Scholarship in Oriental Art History; Rhys Carpenter (Bryn Mawr)—American Archaeological Scholarship.

Music

Three essays: Frank L. Harrison (Oxford)—A European View of American Musicological Scholarship; Claude Palisca (Yale)—American Musicological Scholarship in the Field of Western Music; Mantle Hood (UCLA)—American Musicological Scholarship in the Field of Non-Western Music.

History

One volume on historical scholarship in America to be written by John Higham (Rutgers), with the assistance of Leonard Krieger (Yale) and Felix Gilbert (Bryn Mawr).

Religion

Clyde Holbrook (Oberlin) will write an essay on the study of religion as a field for scholarship and teaching in the humanities. Richard Gilman (The National Council on Religion in Higher Education) will make a study of the educational background of scholars in the field of religion.

Seven scholars will write a critical and descriptive history of recent

American scholarship in the field of religion: John E. Smith (Yale)—Philosophy of Religion; H. Orlinsky (Jewish Institute of Religion); Robert M. Grant (University of Chicago)—Biblical Studies (N.T.) in the Context of Early Christianity; Claude Welch (University of Pennsylvania)—Theology; Philip Ashby (Princeton)—History of Religion; James Nichols (University of Chicago)—Church History; James Luther Adams (Harvard)—Christian Ethics and Moral Philosophy.

Philosophy

A single volume in six parts with the possibility of a general essay being added later: Hilary Putnam (Princeton)—Logic; Herbert Feigl (University of Minnesota)—Philosophy of Science; Roderick Chisholm (Brown)—Theory of Knowledge; Manley Thompson (University of Chicago)—Metaphysics; William Frankena (University of Michigan)—Ethics; John Passmore (Australian National University)—History of Philosophy; Arthur Murphy (University of Texas)—Introductory Essay.

Literature

Three essays on related topics: C. L. Barber (Amherst)—An Essay Illustrating the Influence of Anthropology, Psychology, and Other Ancillary Disciplines on Recent American Literary Scholarship; Walter Sutton (Syracuse)—A Study of Recent American Criticism with Particular Attention to Terminology and the Criteria of Value Used by Leading American Critics; David Daiches (Cambridge)—General Essay on the Study of Literature in America from the Point of View of a Distinguished European Scholar; Howard Hugo (University of California, Berkeley)—A General Essay on the Study of Foreign Literature in America. J. H. Hanford, Consultant.

Linguistics

W. Haas (University of Manchester, England)—An Essay on the Study of Linguistics in America; Rulon Wells III (Yale)—The Influence of Linguistics on the Study of Philosophy in America; Roman Jakobson (Harvard)—The Influence of Linguistics on the Study of Literature in America.

Classics

Eric Havelock (Harvard)—A Critical and Descriptive Essay on Recent American Classical Scholarship.

Asian Studies

A critical and descriptive history of recent American scholarship in the field of Asian Studies. The collaborators are yet to be selected.

R. H. Knapp

A study of the sociological background of American humanistic scholars similar in form to Knapp and Goodrich, *Origins of American Scientists*, Chicago, 1952.

THE ACLS SUMMER INSTITUTE PROGRAM: AN EVALUATION

By GORDON B. TURNER, *Executive Associate, ACLS*

*This evaluation was based upon visits to the following institutes:
Summer Seminar in Art, Oberlin College; Summer Institute in
History, University of Washington; Summer Institute in Latin,
Stanford University.*

The main impression gained from visiting these institutes is that the ACLS program is having a greater impact and wider significance than had been realized. Having based our evaluation of the 1960 institutes upon reports submitted by their Directors and upon occasional letters of appreciation from individual recipients of grants, we had not been aware of some of the most important ramifications of the program. It has been known from the syllabi and from the caliber of the instructors that the quality of instruction has been high and that the individual participants have returned to their classes better prepared in their subjects than before. But written reports cannot convey the electric atmosphere that pervades these institutes, nor do they indicate the new respect and rapport that is developing between the school teachers and the scholars. Furthermore, only personal conversations with a wide variety of people on the spot can reveal the extent to which both administrative and teaching staffs of participating schools and universities welcome these institutes as unequalled opportunities to raise the level of excellence of secondary education.

Rapprochement Between Specialists and Educators

One unplanned result of the institute program is the new relationship that is developing between the teaching faculties of the schools and the universities. This is admittedly still a fledgling development since the number of institutes has been small, but it gives evidence that the program can be an important means of fulfilling what the ACLS views as its primary role in the field of secondary education; namely, to promote an interest on the part of scholars in educational matters at all levels, and especially to bring about a rapprochement between subject-matter specialists and professional educators.

The high school teachers participating in these institutes found their instructors to have not only a great depth of knowledge but an ability to make their subjects come alive. The participants discovered, in other words, that specialization and research do not necessarily make pedants of scholars, but in fact give them the insights essential for proper presentation of their subjects. The implications of this for teacher education may well be imagined, for if a large number of educators can be similarly convinced that knowledge

of subject matter rather than teaching methods is the real key to successful teaching, the present emphasis on pedagogical courses may decline.

The participants also found that their instructors were more aware of the problems faced by school teachers than they had expected. This was particularly true in the world history course at the University of Washington institute where day after day experts came before the group to explain what they would teach within a limited period at the high school level. None insisted that his own area or period of history must be included, but all took care to point out the important facts, trends, and interpretations of his own special field of interest. Moreover, each reviewed existing high school textbooks, pointing out strengths and weaknesses, and recommending the most useful texts and supplementary reading materials available. The participants were grateful for an approach which was specifically geared to their needs, and it added immeasurably to their respect for the scholars to know that they were sympathetic to the problems faced by teachers in the schools.

The instructors on their part were extremely impressed by the participants' eagerness to learn and willingness to work. The fact that the teachers were buying large numbers of books with their own money for use by their colleagues, their students, and themselves, combined with the fact that on all occasions, formal and informal, they displayed an active interest in their subject, did a great deal to convince the instructors that they were dealing with a devoted group of people.

A second important result of these institutes is the extent to which they raise the confidence and morale of the teachers involved. This comes in part, of course, from learning more about their subjects and is an inevitable by-product of any good course of instruction. But these institutes have some rather unique inspirational features. In the first place, the very fact that there is an organization sufficiently interested in secondary school teachers of humanistic subjects to support ventures of this kind affords a tremendous psychological boost. It is doubtful whether many people fully realize the adverse effect that the National Defense Education Act, weighted as it is in favor of the sciences, has had upon this group of teachers. One has only to visit one of these institutes to see the dissatisfaction and even bitterness they feel at this neglect, and the rise in esprit which the institutes are producing.

It is not simply that the American Council of Learned Societies has given them scholarships however (although many could not have attended without them); it is the fact that the ACLS, the university administrators, and the faculties have given concrete evidence of their interest by investing heavily in time, funds, and energy in order to provide them with this opportunity to become better teachers.

The teachers, in their turn, have responded vigorously and their sense of appreciation is evident. Although these were selected groups of teachers, a

good many of them had been educated in teachers colleges which lacked adequate staffs and facilities, and were then assigned to small towns or rural communities where they had no opportunity to read or discuss mutual problems with colleagues. The sense of inadequacy and isolation which resulted from this situation could not help but be reflected in their teaching. The opportunity for a concentrated period of reading and study and for close contact with colleagues and with experts in their fields inevitably inspired them to work intensively and gave them a degree of confidence that few of them had known before. Most of the Latin teachers had little feeling for the culture and civilization of Rome (several had read neither Virgil nor Cicero); the history teachers were relying upon outmoded interpretations of history; and for the most part the art teachers either lacked experience in studio or had never had any courses in art appreciation or the history of art. The institutes supplied these needs and in the process instilled the teachers with a new sense of security and enthusiasm for their subjects. Teaching methods were completely ignored in one of the three institutes, and yet it is evident from talking with the participants in all three that they are full of new ideas and are confident that they will develop means to present them to their classes. By quickening their minds and enlarging the scope of their knowledge, the institutes have given them the means, the motivation, and the self assurance to become vastly improved teachers.

Financing is Feasible

Finally, there is perhaps more reason to believe than was formerly thought that the task of re-educating teachers through summer institutes is a feasible and practical undertaking. It is evident, of course, that the financial costs will be large and that staffing of institutes with high quality instructors will pose a problem. Yet there are reasons to believe that the costs may not run as high as was originally estimated and that enough able scholars may be secured in most fields to staff the necessary number of institutes. It is also to be hoped that in the long run teacher education will be improved sufficiently to render summer institutes unnecessary, and this is likely to be the case when the graduates of institutes voice strong demands for it.

Conversations with faculties and university officials of the host institutions lend credence to the view that some universities may be willing to underwrite a portion of the costs in order to support a program which they firmly believe to be essential and valuable. If the host institutions would absorb part of the tuition costs (and there is reason to believe some would), the principal burden remaining would be for teachers' stipends and travel expenses. The latter can be kept within reasonable bounds if participants are drawn from the immediate locality of the institute—a procedure which has definite advantages apart from costs—and stipends themselves can be based on need. In this year's institutes it has been found that about one-half of the participants could have attended without stipends. Less is known about the ability of the schools

themselves to defray any of the remaining costs, but with principals and teachers as enthusiastic as they are, it might be possible to induce school boards or boards of education to make a few scholarships available. Indeed, there have been cases where small amounts of money have been made available by the schools as part of institute programs, and others have shown an interest in doing something in the future.

There are, of course, a large number of schools and colleges that could not contribute financially, just as there are states where salaries are so low that few, if any, of their teachers could attend without stipends. Yet even in these cases much can be done for a whole school district by ensuring that a few of its influential teachers have an opportunity to attend a first-rate institute. There is a strong propensity on the part of most participants in these institutes to share with their colleagues at home the new ideas and particularly the reading lists they have acquired. A good many department heads, for example, attended this summer's institutes, and they made it clear that they had every intention of instituting curricular reforms on their return. In a number of school districts, the selection of textbooks is determined by committees composed of department heads, and it can be expected that both texts and supplementary reading materials will henceforth be chosen on the basis of their institute experience.

The inclusion of curriculum supervisors and principals in this program is difficult, but in those cases where such groups have attended conferences especially called to give them an opportunity to observe institutes in operation and to talk with the staff and participants the results have been most encouraging. Sympathetic support of the goals of these institutes is essential if principals are to give the teachers free rein in curricular reform and to provide them with the materials and facilities necessary for improvement and revision. The support of principals is also necessary if any kind of a local scholarship program is to be adopted. The limited experience to date does not provide any concrete evidence that schools could or would make scholarship funds available, but the principals who have been involved or have had teachers involved in ACLS institutes have for the most part responded enthusiastically to the program.

Expansion of Program is ACLS Goal

The ACLS program has also generated a wholly unexpected degree of enthusiasm among the teachers; it has demonstrated the need and the value of such institutes to the schools and universities, and it has found evidence that college professors are willing to sacrifice their own work temporarily in order to assist conscientious teachers in the schools. A good many professors involved in the ACLS program have devoted weeks of time in preparation and teaching and long hours of informal discussion with the participants both during the institutes and in their follow-up phases, and they fully realize

the amount of work connected with them. Yet they are recommending that institutes of this kind become standard offerings at as many major universities as possible and be held occasionally at as many other institutions as is feasible. Knowing that they have been dealing with a highly selected group of teachers at the ACLS institutes, they realize for the first time how serious are the basic deficiencies in the education of many of the nation's high school teachers. They are also convinced of the ability and eagerness of these men and women to acquire the fundamentals of their profession and want them to have the opportunity to do so.

It is the hope of the ACLS that the program of Summer Institutes may continue and grow to be an increasingly significant means of bringing the highest humanistic scholarship to bear upon secondary education. Although the funds presently available are small, two or three Institutes will be held in the summer of 1962; arrangements for the more distant future are under active consideration.

CORRESPONDENCE

The report of Eugene F. Rice of Cornell University on Non-Western Material in the Undergraduate Curriculum (Newsletter, September 1961, p. 7) has elicited a number of replies. We are happy to print below one of these statements, and Professor Rice's response to it.

I have read with great interest your issue containing the "Regional Associates Survey of Non-Western Material in the Undergraduate Curriculum." The survey is extremely useful, covering as it does many institutions. I must, however, comment on the entry for Cornell University, submitted by Dr. Eugene F. Rice.

(1) We do require an Asian language of our undergraduate majors but do not require honors standing, as reported. There is an Honors Course, to be sure, but by no means all our majors enter it.

(2) In addition to those listed, we offer the following languages: Urdu, Malay and Quechua.

(3) While the two points above are minor, perhaps, I regard as far more grave the attitude displayed by Dr. Rice toward non-Western studies. He is quoted as writing, "the undoubted practical value and civic usefulness of elementary Burmese should not be allowed to obscure the far greater cultural value of French nor the vocational knowledge of African cultural patterns the civilizing knowledge of the Italian Renaissance."

It is useful to have occasional reminders of the myopia of our colleagues, I suppose, but I find this singularly provincial sentiment entirely out of place in the survey in which it is quoted.

Burmese is not culturally the equal of French, I take it. Does this suggest that Chinese, Japanese and Sanskrit are also to be relegated to the limbo of lesser languages to be acquired merely for their civic utility? Those so unfamiliar with the massive accomplishments of these literatures as to imagine them to represent an achievement secondary to the French are, I feel, to be urged to look to the insufficiencies of their own educational attainments.

African cultural patterns may, we are informed, be vocationally of moment, but a knowledge of the Italian Renaissance is civilizing. Presumably, then, other non-Western cultural developments are somehow less civilized than those of our own heritage. Surely Sung China, Heian Japan, and India's Vedic period are accomplishments worthy of the respect of Western man, and I should have thought of obvious civilizing potential. Ignorance of them is as serious a fault as condescension.

It would be foolish to deny the peculiar relevance of our own heritage to the education of students in American institutions of higher learning. To

suggest, however, that departure from our own tradition in pursuing one's undergraduate education is primarily for "vocational" or "practical" purposes and somehow less "civilizing" is to overstep the bounds of both propriety and reason.

ROBERT J. SMITH

Chairman, Department, of Far Eastern Studies

Cornell University

It is embarrassing to be reminded in public that scholars may legitimately study anything. I had hitherto assumed that every scholar took this for granted. On the other hand, undergraduates are normally not scholars in this sense; and the object of undergraduate instruction is not the advancement of knowledge, but its selective propagation by scholars who do advance knowledge. At issue are the judgments of value by which this selection is made.

I am most familiar with departments of history. For reasons of piety and provincial interest American departments teach more American history than anything else. With a rude, and more objective, common sense they normally offer Greek history but not Egyptian; Russian but not Polish; Brazilian but not Peruvian; English but not Swedish; the Italian fifteenth century but not the eighteenth. No historian will assert that Peruvian and Swedish history are not legitimate, interesting and valuable fields of study. Yet few will doubt the propriety of an undergraduate studying Greek history before or rather than Egyptian. Its problems are more interesting, its content more valuable than Egyptian. It cultivates intelligence and taste in a way that the study of Egyptian history does not.

Similarly, languages are important or less important, valuable or less valuable, for what one can read in them: for poems, plays and histories; for what they can offer us of scientific experiment, religious sentiment or philosophic experience; for the quality, complexity and sophistication of the culture they transmit. In this perspective Burmese, Indonesian, Thai, Vietnamese (and Urdu, Malay and Quechua, which Mr. Smith has reminded me I omitted from my original list) are minor languages. In our present society they are taught and learned at the undergraduate level for considerations of utility and power. A man who has learned Quechua is not, by virtue of that new knowledge, potentially a more civilized being; he is simply a man who knows Quechua. The man who has studied French may also be simply a man who knows French (and even this is often questionable). But the possibility of enlightenment is there.

It is not precisely this, however, which has provoked the zeal of Mr. Smith. He is annoyed because I have apparently belittled great periods of

the Chinese, Japanese and Indian past and, presumably, the civilizing potential of oriental culture as a whole. This was not my intention; and I am exasperated by Mr. Smith's determination to make it so. (He thinks what I did say was bad enough. Surely he would not want me to say worse.)

My position is briefly this: on the one hand, that the language, history and civilization of China or Japan are useful, legitimate and enriching subjects of undergraduate instruction; on the other, that what we commonly call "Western" civilization is a far *more* enriching subject of instruction; that, consequently, Western literature, science, history and art should be the principal subjects of the undergraduate curriculum. A department of Fine Arts should feel deprived if it cannot offer a course on Chinese painting, but the deprivation would be far greater if it failed to offer a course on Italian painting from Giotto to Tintoretto. A good history department should offer Chinese history, but it would be misguided if it did not continue to make Western history from the Greeks to the end of the nineteenth century the core of its instruction. Universities offer many more courses on English, Spanish, German, French, Italian and Russian literature than on Chinese, Japanese and Indian. This reflects the greater richness of the Western literary inheritance and not merely obtuse "ethnocentrism". A department of music does not sin mortally by failing to offer instruction in the history of Asian music. It would betray its function entirely if it omitted Bach or Mozart.

There can be nothing condescending or invidious about the recognition of the obvious. Nor is a thing bad because it is less good. It is merely less good. Nor again does it follow that because Western subjects appropriately engage the larger part of the undergraduate's attention they should engage it all. On the contrary, we still offer too few non-Western subjects, even at Cornell, where we teach more than most. But even among non-Western subjects the emphasis is significant. We teach Quechua, Urdu and Malay but no classical Arabic. The offerings of a great university should be as rich and various as possible. To lecture on Chartres and not on Anghor Wat is a limitation. To teach Urdu but not Arabic reveals a confusion of values. And that is what I was protesting in the first place.

EUGENE F. RICE

Department of History

Cornell University

ANNOUNCEMENTS

John Hay Fellows Program. Approximately 170 public senior high school teachers and 70 public school administrators will be selected to participate in four Summer Institutes in the Humanities in July, 1962. The Institutes will be held at Bennington, Colorado College, The University of Oregon and Williams.

Those attending will receive \$300 for the four-week period, June 30-July 28, plus allowances for dependents and for travel. Applicants should have at least five years of high school teaching experience and should be not more than 55 years old.

Correspondence should be addressed to Charles R. Keller, Director, John Hay Fellows Program, 9 Rockefeller Plaza, New York City. Applications will close on February 9, 1962.

Xth International Congress of the History of Science. The Congress will be held at Cornell University from 26 August to 31 August, 1962, and at the American Philosophical Society, Philadelphia, from 31 August to 2 September, 1962.

Communications on the following subjects are invited: I. General problems in the history of science; methods, philosophy and historiography of science; II. History of technology and applied science; III. Science in antiquity; IV. Science in the Middle Ages and the Renaissance; V. Mathematics and the exact sciences after 1600; VI. Biological and earth sciences after 1600; VII. Sciences of man. Communications should be addressed to: The Secretary, Xth International Congress of the History of Science, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y. (U.S.A.).

BOOKS FOR THE UNIVERSITY OF NIGERIA

In cooperation with the Agency for International Development, Michigan State University is helping develop the University of Nigeria which was established on October 7, 1960 at Nsukka, Nigeria.

The University started with an enrollment of 220 students and a faculty of 13, and in a year has grown to a student body of 1,000

and a staff of 100. Therefore, there is an urgent need for books in agriculture, anthropology, biological sciences, business administration, economics, education, engineering, finance, home economics, humanities, journalism, languages, law, music, physical education, political science, religion, secretarial studies, and sociology.

Fairly recent used, or new books will be greatly appreciated. Books may be sent to: Dr. George H. Axinn, Coordinator, University of Nigeria Program, A-4 Wells Hall, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan.



NEWSLETTER MAILING LIST

A return post card was enclosed with every copy of the October Newsletter in an attempt to refine our mailing list.

Those who have not returned this card and from whom we do not hear before the first of the year will be removed from the Newsletter mailing list.

